chair John Chiang member Judy Chu, Ph.D. member Michael C. Genest

State of California
Franchise Tax Board

April 2008 Franchise Tax Board Public Litigation Roster

All currently active cases and those recently closed are listed on the roster. Activity or changes with respect to a case appear in bold-face type. Any new cases will appear in bold-face type.

A list of new cases that have been added to the roster for the month is also provided, as well as a list of cases that have been closed and will be dropped from the next report.

The Franchise Tax Board posts the Litigation Roster on its Internet site. The Litigation Roster can be found at: http://www.ftb.ca.gov/law/litrstr/index.html.

The Litigation Rosters for the last four years may be found on the Internet site.

FRANCHISE AND INCOME TAX Closed Cases – April 2008

<u>Case Name</u> <u>Court Number</u>

Colgate-Palmolive, Co. & Subsidiaries Sacramento Superior Court Docket No. 03AS00707

Jurika, William & Michelle San Francisco Superior Court Docket No. CGC07466483

Schenck, William E. & Karren Sacramento Superior Court No. 07AS04188

FRANCHISE AND INCOME TAX New Cases – April 2008

<u>Case Name</u> <u>Court Number</u>

NONE

FRANCHISE AND INCOME TAX MONTHLY REFUND LITIGATION ROSTER

April 2007

ABBOTT LABORATORIES & Affiliates v. Franchise Tax Board

Los Angeles Superior Court Docket No. BC369808 Filed - 04/20/07

Court of Appeal, 2nd Appellate Dist. No. B204210

Taxpaver's Counsel FTB's Counsel J. Pat Powers **Brian Wesley**

Baker & McKenzie, LLP

Scott L Brandman

Baker & McKenzie, LLP

Issue: Whether Plaintiffs were entitled to a deduction under section 24402 after the statute was found to be

unconstitutional.

Years: 1999-2000 \$2,340,093.00 Amount

Status: Application of Plaintiffs/Appellant's counsel Scott L. Brandman to Appear Pro Hac Vice granted.

APPLE, INC. v. Franchise Tax Board

San Francisco Superior Court Docket No. 08471129 Filed - 01/16/08

Taxpayer's Counsel FTB's Counsel Jeffrey M. Vesely Kristian Whitten

Pillsbury, Winthrop, Shaw, Pittman, LLP

Issues: 1. Whether the Franchise Tax Board properly determined the order in which dividends are paid from

earnings and profits.

2. Whether the Franchise Tax Board improperly allocated and disallowed interest.

09/30/89 Year: Amount \$231,038.00

Status: Case Management Conference scheduled for June 20, 2008.

BAKERSFIELD MALL, LLC v. Franchise Tax Board

San Francisco Superior Court Docket No. No. CGC07462728 Filed -04/25/07

Court of Appeal, 1st Appellate District No. A119709

Taxpayer's Counsel FTB's Counsel

Amy L. Silverstein, Edwin Antolin Marguerite Stricklin

Silverstein & Pomerantz, LLP

- <u>Issues</u>: 1. Whether the LLC fee imposed on an LLC doing business entirely within California by Rev. Tax. Code §17942 is unconstitutional under the due process, equal protection and commerce clauses of the U.S. Constitution.
 - 2. Whether Rev. Tax. Code §17942 violates Article XIII, section 26 of the California Constitution.
 - 3. Whether Rev. Tax. Code §17942 constitutes an invalid exercise of the states police power and is void.

Years: 2000 through 2004 Amount \$56,537.00

Status: Case Management Conference held on April 22, 2008. Trial continued to July 24, 2008.

BANISTER, JOSEPH R. v. Franchise Tax Board

Sacramento Superior Court No. 06CS00930 Filed -07/10/06Sacramento Superior Court Docket No. 07AS04091 Transferred -09/14/07Taxpayer's Counsel FTB's Counsel Joseph R. Banister (Pro Per) Amy Winn

1. Whether plaintiff has a California filing obligation. Issues:

2. Whether penalties were properly assessed against plaintiff.

2002 \$895.00 Tax Year: Amount

\$537.50 Penalty

Status: Docket No. 07AS04091:

Defendant's Motion to Strike Plaintiff's Demand for Jury Trial granted on March 20, 2008. Trial

Setting Conference scheduled for June 16, 2008.

BAYER CORPORATION v. Franchise Tax Board

Sacramento Superior Court Docket No. 07AS03350 Filed -07/23/07Taxpayer's Counsel FTB's Counsel Steven J. Green Eric J. Coffill, Carley A. Roberts Morrison & Foerster, LLP

Issue: Whether the value of Plaintiff's inventory was properly calculated for each of the years for purposes of

determining its cost of goods sold.

Years: 1993-1994 Amount \$2,481,551.00

Status: Case Management Conference held on February 21, 2008. Discovery proceeding.

BRAR, KALDEEP S. & IMELDA A. & PROFESSIONAL RESOURCE ENTERPRISES, INC. v.

Franchise Tax Board

Los Angeles Superior Court Docket No. BC365233 Filed - 01/24/07Taxpayer's Counsel FTB's Counsel

Robert F Klueger, Esq. Mark P. Richelson

Boldra, Klueger & Stein, LLP

<u>Issue</u>: 1. Whether FTB properly determined the Los Angeles Revitalization Zone credit carryovers to which

Plaintiffs were entitled.

<u>Year</u>: 1999 <u>Amount</u> \$335,885.53

Status: Defendant's Notice of Ruling Granting Motion for Summary Judgment filed on

April 15, 2008. Defendant's Notice of Entry of Judgment filed on April 19, 2008.

BRATTON, KERRY M. v. Franchise Tax Board

San Francisco Superior Court Docket No. CGC07461671 Filed – 03/23/07

Taxpayer's Counsel

FTB's Counsel

Thomas F. Carlucci Amy J. Winn

Foley & Lardner, LLP

Issue: Whether the penalty for the promotion of an abusive tax shelter provided for in section 19177 was

properly assessed to Plaintiff.

Year: 2003 Amount \$3,996,235.94 Penalty

Status: Case Management Conference held on April 25, 2008. Case bifurcated with the retroactivity

issue to be tried first.

CITY NATIONAL CORPORATION v. Franchise Tax Board

Los Angeles Superior Court Docket No. BC334772 Filed – 06/10/05

Court of Appeal, 2nd Appellate District No. B189240

California Supreme Court No. S150563

Taxpayer's CounselFTB's CounselKenneth R. Chiate, Mary S. ThomasDonald R. Currier

Quinn, Emanuel, Urquhart, Oliver & Hedges, LLP

Sherrill Johnson

Offices of the General Counsel

City National Bank

<u>Issues</u>: 1. Whether Plaintiff improperly engaged in tax shelter transaction involving Regulated Investment Trusts (REITs) and Regulated Investment Companies (RICs) during the subject years.

2. Whether certain subsidiaries were exempt from California taxation as IRC 501(c)(15) entities.

3. Whether Plaintiff has satisfied the requirement of exhausting all administrative remedies in order to

maintain a lawsuit.

Years: 1999 through 2003 Amount \$84,676,129.00

Status: Case Management Conference continued to June 6, 2008.

CITY NATIONAL CORPORATION & Subs. v. Franchise Tax Board

Sacramento Superior Court Docket No. 06AS02275

<u>Taxpayer's Counsel</u> Kenneth R. Chiate

Quinn, Emanuel, Urquhart Oliver & Hedges, LLP

Filed – 06/06/06 <u>FTB's Counsel</u> Molly K. Mosley

Sherrill Johnson

Offices of the General Counsel

City National Bank

<u>Issue</u>: Whether Plaintiffs improperly engaged in tax shelter transaction involving Real Estate Investment Trusts

(REITs).

<u>Year</u>: 2004 <u>Amount</u> \$23,900,000.00

Status: Defendant's Notice of Entry of Order to Stay Action Pending Certain Developments in Related

Los Angeles Action filed on April 3, 2008.

DELUCCHI, MARIO & KATHLEEN, et al. v. Franchise Tax Board

Sacramento Superior Court Docket No. 06AS02661 Filed – 06/22/06

Court of Appeal, 3rd Appellate District No. C056503

Taxpayer's CounselFTB's CounselHarry Gordon Oliver IIGeorge Spanos

Attorney at Law

Issues: 1. Whether Plaintiffs properly computed income on an installment sale.

- 2. Whether Plaintiffs may be deemed to have elected out of the installment method.
- 3. Whether Plaintiffs' gain on the sale of a stock qualified for exemption as Small Business Stock in 1995.

<u>Year</u>: 1995 <u>Amount</u> \$954,800.00

Status: Defendant/Respondent's Reply Brief to be filed on May 2, 2008.

DELUXE CORPORATION v. Franchise Tax Board

San Francisco Superior Court Docket No. CGC07462305 Filed - 04/11/07<u>Taxpayer's Counsel</u>

Amy L. Silverstein, Edwin Antolin Karen Yiu

Silverstein & Pomerantz

Issues: 1. Whether the Franchise Tax Board has the authority to review the validity of enterprise zone credit vouchers issued by an enterprise zone.

2. Whether the Franchise Tax Board properly disallowed enterprise zone credits claimed by plaintiff.

Years: 1999 through 2001 Amount \$979,741.00

Status: Discovery proceeding. Mandatory Settlement Conference rescheduled to July 1, 2008, trial rescheduled to July 14, 2008.

DICON FIBEROPTICS, INC. v. Franchise Tax Board

Los Angeles Superior Court Docket No. BC367885 Filed – 03/13/07

Court of Appeal, 2nd Appellate District No. B202997

Taxpayer's Counsel
Thomas R. Freeman, Paul S. Chan.

FTB's Counsel
Mark Richelson

Bird, Marella, Boxer, Wolpert,

Nessim, Drooks & Lincenberg, P.C.

Marty Dakessian

Mardiros, Hagop, Dakessian

Issue: Whether Franchise Tax Board properly denied EZ Credits claimed by Plaintiff.

<u>Year</u>: Ending 03/31/07 <u>Amount</u> \$1,104,992.00

Status: Extension of Time for Filing Respondent's Brief granted to May 14, 2008.

DUFFIELD, DAVID A. & CHERYL D. v. Franchise Tax Board

San Francisco Superior Court Docket No. CGC07459331 Filed – 01/05/07

<u>Taxpayer's Counsel</u>

Jeffrey M. Vesely David Lew

Kerne H. O. Matsubara, Annie H. Huang Pillsbury, Winthrop, Shaw, Pittman, LLP

<u>Issues</u>: 1. Whether Plaintiffs exchange of PeopleSoft Stock for the stock of Nevada Pacific Development Corporation qualified as a tax-free exchange pursuant to Revenue and Taxation Code section 17321.

- 2. Whether Plaintiffs were subject to the penalty imposed by section 19777.5.
- 3. Whether the penalty imposed by section 19777.5 meets Due Process requirements.
- 4. Whether Plaintiffs were entitled to an abatement of interest pursuant to Revenue and Taxation Code section 19104.

<u>Year</u>: 1994 <u>Amount</u> \$7,152,029.00 Tax \$4,006,972.25 Penalty

_

Status: Mandatory Settlement Conference held on April 2, 2008. Trial date of April 14, 2008, vacated.

ELS EDUCATIONAL SERVICES, INC. v. Franchise Tax Board

Sacramento Superior Court Docket No. 07AS0307 Filed - 07/05/07<u>Taxpayer's Counsel</u>

Robert R. Rubin Robert Asperger

McDonough, Holland & Allen, PC

<u>Issue</u>: Whether Plaintiff was entitled for California purposes, to elect out of treatment provided by

section 338(h)(10) of the Internal Revenue Code.

<u>Year</u>: 08/28/97 <u>Amount</u> \$630,615.97

Status: Discovery proceeding. Trial Setting Conference scheduled for June 16, 2008.

FREIDBERG, EDWARD AND TRACI REYNOLDS v. Franchise Tax Board

Sacramento Superior Court Docket No. 07AS02358 Filed - 02/02/07<u>Taxpayer's Counsel</u>

Edward Freidberg, Suzanne M. Alves Amy Winn

Freidberg & Parker Larry Keethe

<u>Issue</u>: Whether Franchise Tax Board was required to credit the amount of a non-final judgment to satisfy

Plaintiffs' self-assessed taxes for years subsequent to those involved in the judgment.

<u>Years</u>: 2003 and 2004 <u>Amount</u> \$9,326.32 Penalty

Status: Trial held on March 10, 2008.

GARCIA, W. ROCKE AND GLENDA L. v. Franchise Tax Board

San Francisco Superior Court Docket No. CGC06456659 Filed - 10/02/06<u>Taxpayer's Counsel</u>

William J. McLean Kristian Whitten

A Professional Law Corporation

<u>Issue</u>: 1. Whether Plaintiffs timely acquired replacement real property in compliance with the Internal Revenue Code section 1033.

- 2. Whether a decision by the State Board of Equalization precludes the assessment of penalties pursuant to section 19777.5.
- 3. Whether the penalty assessed by Section 19777.5 satisfies due process requirements.

<u>Year</u>: 1992 <u>Amount</u> \$357,009.00 Tax

\$259,056.00 Penalty

Status: Trial was held on April 2, 2008.

GENERAL MILLS, INC. & SUBSIDIARIES v. Franchise Tax Board

San Francisco Superior Court Docket No. CGC05-439929 Filed – 03/29/05

Court of Appeal, 1st Appellate Dist. No. A120492

Taxpayer's CounselFTB's CounselThomas H. SteeleJoyce Hee

Andres Vallejo, Jeffrey S. Terraciano

Morrison & Foerster LLP

Paul H. Frankel

Morrison & Foerster LLP

<u>Issues</u>: 1. Whether the Plaintiffs' payroll factor was properly computed by excluding foreign employee stock options.

- 2. Whether the Plaintiffs' sales factor was properly calculated by excluding receipts from commodities transactions and short-term financial instruments.
- 3. Whether federal RAR adjustments were properly taken into account.

<u>Years</u>: 1992 through 1997 <u>Amount</u> \$3,950,026.00

Status: Plaintiffs/Appellants' Opening Brief and Joint Appendix, 9 volumes, filed on April 10, 2008.

GENERAL MOTORS CORPORATION, et al. v. Franchise Tax Board

Los Angeles Superior Court Docket No. BC269404 Filed - 03/06/02

Court of Appeal, 2nd Appellate District No. B165665

California Supreme Court No. S127086

Taxpayer's CounselFTB's CounselCharles R. AjalatStephen LewLaw Office of Ajalat, Polley & AyoobDonald Currier

<u>Issues</u>: 1. Whether gross receipts from the disposition of marketable securities were properly excluded from the sales factor.

- 2. Whether interest income was properly characterized as business income.
- 3. Whether dividends received with respect to stock representing less than a 50% voting interest were properly classified as business income.
- 4. Whether the limitation on deductions prescribed by sections 24402 and 24410 resulted in unconstitutional discriminatory taxation.
- 5. Whether various receipts from intangible assets were properly excluded from the sales factor.
- 6. Whether research tax credits were properly limited to the entity incurring the expense.
- 7. Whether a deduction was properly denied with respect to foreign country taxes withheld on dividends.
- 8. Whether the taxpayer is entitled to an increased deduction with respect to depreciation on assets held by foreign country subsidiaries.
- 9. Whether the taxes determined to be owing by the Franchise Tax Board were properly computed and assessed.

<u>Years</u>: 1986 through 1988 <u>Amount</u> \$10,692,755.00

<u>Status</u>: Discovery Proceeding. Final Status Conference scheduled for September 29, 2008. Trial scheduled for October 1, 2008.

GOLDEN WEST HEALTH PLAN, INC. v. Franchise Tax Board

Los Angeles Superior Court Docket No. BC353849 Filed – 06/15/06

Court of Appeal, 2nd Appellate Court Dist. No. B205246

Taxpayer's CounselFTB's CounselAlan R. MalerMarla Markman

Greenberg Traurig, LLP

Issue: Whether Plaintiff made a valid S Corporation election for California purposes.

<u>Years</u>: 04/01/03 through 06/01/03 Amount \$669,045.00

Status: Defendant's Notice of Appeal filed on January 28, 2008.

GONZALES, THOMAS J. II v. Franchise Tax Board

San Francisco Superior Court Docket No. CGC06454297 Filed - 07/18/06 <u>Taxpayer's Counsel</u>
Martin A. Schainbaum, Esq. Filed - 07/18/06 <u>FTB's Counsel</u>
Jeffrey Rich

Martin A. Schainbaum, PLC

Issues: 1. Whether a \$142,000,000.00 capital loss from an abusive tax shelter is allowable.

- 2. Whether a taxpayer self-reporting under VCI is eligible for interest suspension pursuant to section 19116.
- 3. Whether the taxpayer is entitled to deduct legal expenses paid in connection with an investment.

Years: 2000 and 2001 Amount \$12,374,510.00

Status: Hearing held on April 9, 2008; Plaintiff's Motion for Assignment to a single Judge is granted. Trial date of August 18, 2008, is vacated.

HANGER, DWIGHT T. & VICKI J. v. Franchise Tax Board

Los Angeles Superior Court Docket No. BC382988 Filed – 12/28/07

<u>Taxpayer's Counsel</u>

Gordon B. Cutler, Esq. Anthony Sgherzi

<u>Issue</u>: Whether taxpayers constructively received the proceeds from the exchange of LLC memberships for

stock in the taxable year.

Year: 2000 Amount \$324,908.00

Status: Case Management Conference scheduled for April 28, 2008, vacated. Mandatory Settlement

Conference scheduled for October 2, 2008. Final Status Conference scheduled for November 21,

2008. Trial scheduled for December 1, 2008.

HYATT, GILBERT P. v. Franchise Tax Board

Clark County Nevada District Court No. A382999 Filed - 01/06/98

Nevada Supreme Court No. 47141

<u>Taxpayer's Counsel</u>
Thomas L. Steffen & Mark A. Hutchison

<u>FTB's Counsel</u>
James W. Bradshaw

Hutchison & Steffen, H. Bartow Farr III

McDonald, Carano,

Wilson LLP

Las Vegas, Nevada

Issues: 1. Whether Plaintiff was a resident of California from September 26, 1991 through April 2, 1992.

2. Whether the Franchise Tax Board committed various torts with respect to plaintiff and is subject to a claim for damages.

3. Whether the Nevada courts have or should exercise jurisdiction over the Franchise Tax Board.

<u>Years</u>: 1991 and 1992 <u>Amount</u> \$7,545,492.00 Tax

\$5,659,119.00 Penalty

Status: Clark County Nevada District Court

Trial commenced on April 14, 2008.

KANCHANAPOOM, VISUT & MEECHI v. Franchise Tax Board

Los Angeles Superior Court Docket No. NC050569 Filed – 12/04/07

*Taxpayer's Counsel FTB's Counsel

Kenneth J. Catanzarite Ron Ito

Richard Vergel de Dios

Catanzarite Law Corporation

<u>Issue</u>: 1. Whether passive activity and capital losses from the disposition of partnership interests are

deductible in the taxable years in issue.

<u>Years</u>: 1991 through 1995 <u>Amount</u> \$230,632.00

Status: Plaintiffs' Second Amended Complaint filed on April 28, 2008.

MANNING, LAWRENCE T. & JOY v. Franchise Tax Board

Los Angeles Superior Court Docket No. BC382987 Filed – 12/28/07

<u>Taxpayer's Counsel</u>

Gordon B. Cutler, Esq. Anthony Sgherzi

Issue: Whether taxpayers constructively received the proceeds from the exchange of LLC memberships for

stock in the taxable year.

Year: 2000 Amount \$167,710.00

Status: Mandatory Settlement Conference scheduled for October 2, 2008. Final Status Conference

scheduled for November 21, 2008. Trial scheduled for December 1, 2008.

MERCURY GENERAL CORPORATION v. Franchise Tax Board

San Francisco Superior Court Docket No. No. CGC07462688 Filed – 04/25/07

<u>Taxpayer's Counsel</u>

<u>FTB's Counsel</u>

Roy E. Crawford, Roburt J. Waldow

Julian Standen

McDermott, Will & Emery

<u>Issues</u>: 1. Whether a portion of Plaintiff's insurance subsidiary management expenses was properly disallowed under Rev. & Tax. Code § 24425.

2. Whether the amnesty penalty under Rev. & Tax. Code § 19777.5 violates the due process clause of the U.S. Constitution, applies only retroactively, or attaches only after a liability becomes due and payable.

<u>Years</u>: 12/31/93 through 12/31/96 <u>Amount</u> \$7,585,601.28

Status: Plaintiff's First Amended Complaint filed on April 30, 2008. Trial continued to May 6, 2008.

Filed - 02/08/08

Donald R. Currier

FTB's Counsel

MICKELSEN, PAUL L. & PATRICIA A. v. Franchise Tax Board

Los Angeles Superior Court Docket No. BC385197

<u>Taxpayer's Counsel</u> Charles P. Rettig, Esq.

Steven Toscher, Sharyn M. Fisk

Hochman, Salkin, Retigg, Toscher & Perez, P.C.

<u>Issue</u>: Whether a taxpayer self-reporting under VCI is eligible for interest suspension pursuant to section

19116.

<u>Year</u>: 1999 <u>Amount</u> \$537,178.00 Interest

Status: Answer to Complaint filed on March 28, 2008.

MICROSOFT CORPORATION v. Franchise Tax Board

San Francisco Superior Court Docket No. CGC08471260 Filed -01/22/08Taxpayer's Counsel

James P. Kleier, Brian W. Toman

Reed Smith, LLP

Filed -01/22/08Taxpayer's Counsel

Joyce Hee

Lucy Wang

<u>Issues</u>: 1. Whether royalty income received from licensing agreements with Original Equipment Manufacturers should be sourced outside of California based upon costs of performance.

- 2. Whether receipts from trading marketable securities should be included in the sales factor.
- 3. Whether the value of trademarks, copyrights, patents and other intangible assets should be included in the property factor.
- 4. Whether the taxpayer should be allowed a deduction under Revenue and Taxation Code section 24402 for dividends received for the years at issue.

Years: 1995 and 1996 Amount \$25,283,868.00

Status: Order issued on April 23, 2008, stating hearing scheduled for May 6, 2008, is off calendar.

MIKE, ANGELINA v. Franchise Tax Board

San Diego Superior Court Docket No. 37-2007-00067324-CU-MC-CTL Filed – 05/25/07

<u>Taxpayer's Counsel</u> <u>FTB's Counsel</u>

Richard M. Freeman, Carole M Ross

Leslie Branman Smith
Sheppard, Mullin, Richter & Hampton, LLP

<u>Issue</u>: Whether plaintiff's distribution of gaming income derived from revenue generated on a Native American reservation is exempted from California tax because plaintiff resided on the reservation of

another tribe.

Year: 2000 Amount \$31,856.00

Status: Trial scheduled for September 19, 2008. Discovery proceeding.

MONTGOMERY WARD LLC v. Franchise Tax Board v. Franchise Tax Board

San Diego Superior Court Docket No. GIC802767

Filed - 12/30/02

Taxpayer's Counsel

Edwin P. Antolin, Amy Silverstein

Silverstein & Pomerantz, LLP

Domini Pham

<u>Issues</u>: 1. Whether proceeds from the sale, maturity or other disposition of short-term financial instruments were properly excluded from the sales factor.

2. Whether section 24402 Rev. & Tax. Code is constitutional.

<u>Years</u>: 1989 through 1994 <u>Amount</u> \$2,694,192.00

Status: Notice of Entry of Judgment for Plaintiff filed on January 15, 2008.

NEW GAMING SYSTEMS, INC. & AKA INDUSTRIES, INC. v. Franchise Tax Board

Sacramento Superior Court Docket No. 03AS05705 Filed - 10/10/03

<u>Taxpayer's Counsel</u>

Robert R. Rubin FTB's Counsel

Amy Winn

McDonough, Holland & Allen, PC

<u>Issues</u>: 1. Whether New Gaming Systems, Inc., timely filed its suit for refund for the income year ended March 31, 1996.

- 2. Whether a declaratory relief action can be brought to prevent the collection of tax.
- 3. Whether a suit for refund can be maintained for a year in which the amount of tax has not been paid in full.
- 4. Whether Plaintiffs are liable for California taxes on income generated from leases for operating Indian casinos.

Years: 1996 and 1997 Amount \$111,587.87

Status: Trial set for July 23, 2007 postponed, date unknown.

NISSAN NORTH AMERICA, INC. v. Franchise Tax Board

Los Angeles Superior Court Docket No. BC373781

Filed – 07/06/07

Taxpayer's Counsel

Richard J. Ayoob

Ajalat, Polley, Ayoob & Matarese

Ronald N. Ito

Donald R. Currier

Issues: 1. Whether claimed EZ credits were erroneously disallowed.

- 2. Whether Value Added Taxes should be included in the denominator of the sales factor.
- 3. Whether other errors were made in computing the taxpayer's tax.

<u>Years</u>: 04/01/01 through 03/31/02 <u>Amount</u> \$725.632.00

Status: Case Management Conference continued to May 5, 2008.

NORTHWEST ENERGETIC SERVICES, LLC v. Franchise Tax Board

San Francisco Superior Court Docket No.CGC05-437721 Filed – 01/15/05

Court of Appeal 1st Appellate Court Dist. No. A114805

Court of Appeal, 1st Appellate Court Dist. No. A115841 (Attorneys' Fees)

Court of Appeal, 1st Appellate Court Dist. No. A115950 (Attorneys' Fees)

California Supreme Court No. S162627

<u>Taxpayer's Counsel</u> <u>FTB's Counsel</u>

Amy L. Silverstein, Edwin Antolin Marguerite C. Stricklin

Silverstein & Pomerantz

<u>Issue</u>: Whether Revenue and Taxation Code section 17942, which imposes a tax upon the "total income from

all sources reportable to this state" of LLC registered with the Secretary of State, violates the Due

Process Clause and Commerce Clauses.

<u>Years</u>: 12/31/97 through 12/31/01 <u>Amount</u> \$25,067.00 Fees

\$ 3,764.29 Penalty

Status: Petition for Review with the California Supreme Court (requesting review of portion of decision relating to attorneys' fees) was filed by the FTB on April 14, 2008. The remainder of the

iudgment is now final.

RIVER GARDEN RETIREMENT HOME v. Franchise Tax Board

San Francisco Superior Court Docket No. CGC07467783 Filed – 10/02/07

Taxpayer's CounselFTB's CounselAmy L. Silverstein, Edwin AntolinDavid Lew

Silverstein & Pomerantz, LLP

<u>Issues</u>: 1. Whether Plaintiff is entitled to a dividend received deduction under Revenue and Taxation Code section 24402 for the years in issue.

2. Whether the penalty imposed by Revenue and Taxation Code section 19777.5 was properly assessed.

<u>Years</u>: 1999 and 2000 <u>Amount</u> \$5,375.26 Tax

\$ 895.93 Penalty

Status: Mandatory Settlement Conference set for September 5, 2008. Trial set for September 22, 2008.

ROHR, INC. v. Franchise Tax Board

San Diego Superior Court Docket No. 37-2007-00070925-CU-CO-CTL Filed – 09/07/07

Court of Appeal, 4th Dist., Div. 1 No. D052309

California Supreme Court No. S161612

<u>Taxpayer's Counsel</u>
Mark L. Mann

<u>FTB's Counsel</u>
Brian D. Wesley

Luce, Forward, Hamilton & Scripps LLP

<u>Issues</u>: 1. Whether Rohr, Inc. was engaged in a unitary business with Rohr Credit Corporation, its subsidiary.

2. Whether losses incurred by Rohr Credit Corporation constituted nonbusiness income.

3. Whether plaintiff is entitled to attorneys' fees.

4. Whether a suit for refund can be maintained where not all the interest due has been paid.

<u>Years</u>: 07/31/85 through 07/31/87 <u>Amount</u> \$5,155,415.00

Status: Petition for Review was denied on April 16, 2008.

SHAW, BRIAN K. v. Franchise Tax Board

Los Angeles Superior Court Docket No. BC378829 Filed – 10/10/07

*Taxpayer's Counsel FTB's Counsel

David Roth, Esq. Diane Spencer-Shaw

Hochman, Salkin, Rettig, Toscher & Perez

Issues: 1. Whether Plaintiff was a resident of California for tax purposes.

2. Whether assessing a penalty under Revenue and Taxation Code section 19777.5 violates Due Process.

<u>Years</u>: 1990 through 1994 <u>Amount</u> \$487,084.00 Tax

\$ 89,534.00 Penalty

Status: Trial Setting Conference scheduled for July 31, 2008.

SHIMMON, EDWARD & ANNELIESE v. Franchise Tax Board

Los Angeles Superior Court Docket No. BC363822

Taxpayer's Counsel
Charles P. Rettig, Sharyn M. Fisk
Hochman, Salkin, Rettig, Toscher & Perez, P.C.

Filed – 12/22/06

FTB's Counsel
Lisa W. Chao
Donald Currier

Issue: Whether a taxpayer filing under the first option of VCI was eligible for the interest suspension

provided by section 19116.

<u>Year</u>: 1999 <u>Amount</u> \$515,422.00 Interest

Status: Order, Court Stay of Proceedings until June 12, 2008, pending State Board of Equalization's decisions

in the VCI cases.

THODE, JEROME P. & KATHLEEN A. THODE-FERRIS v. Franchise Tax Board

Los Angeles Superior Court Docket No. BC383969 Filed -01/17/08<u>Taxpayer's Counsel</u>

Gordon B. Cutler, Esq. Filed -01/17/08Anthony Sgherzi

<u>Issue</u>: Whether taxpayers constructively received the proceeds from the exchange of LLC memberships for

stock in the taxable year.

<u>Year</u>: 2000 <u>Amount</u> \$137,694.00

Status: Case Management Conference rescheduled to June 5, 2008.

TOY'S "R" US, INC. & AFFILIATES v. Franchise Tax Board

Sacramento Superior Court Docket No. 01AS04316 Filed - 07/17/01

Court of Appeal, 4th Appellate Court No. C045386

California Supreme Court No. S143422

<u>Taxpayer's Counsel</u>
Eric J. Coffill

Steven J. Green

Carley A. Roberts

Morrison & Foerster, LLP

Issue: Whether gross receipts from the sale of short-term financial investment were properly excluded from

the documentation of the sales factor.

<u>Years</u>: 1991 through 1994 <u>Amount</u> \$5,342,117.00

Status: Case is transferred to the Court of Appeal on November 15, 2006, with directions to vacate its decision

and to reconsider the cause of action in light of <u>Microsoft v. Franchise Tax Board</u> (2006) 39 Cal.4th 750 and <u>General Motors v. Franchise Tax Board</u> (2006) 39 Cal.4th 773. (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 29.3(d).)

VENTAS FINANCE I, LLC v. Franchise Tax Board

San Francisco Superior Court Docket No. 05-440001 Filed – 04/01/05

Court of Appeal, 1st Appellate Court No. A116277 & A117751

Taxpayer's Counsel FTB's Counsel

Amy L. Silverstein, Edwin Antolin

Marguerite Stricklin

Silverstein & Pomerantz, LLP

<u>Issue</u>: Whether Revenue and Taxation Code section 17942, which imposes a tax based upon the "total income

from all sources reportable to this state" of LLC registered with the Secretary of State, violates the Due

Process Clause and Commerce Clause.

<u>Years</u>: 2001 through 2003 <u>Amount</u> \$29,580.00

Status: Plaintiff/Respondent Ventas' Request for Oral Argument, and additional citations for Oral Argument,

filed on March 5, 2008.